
From: Sharon Bruns[S [REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 2:07:44 PM
To: PUC
Subject: Stop Dakota Access HP14-002

Dear Public Service Commissioners,

Docket Number: HP14-002

I oppose the construction of the proposed Dakota Access crude oil pipeline because it will pose a threat of serious injury to the environment and current or future inhabitants. The pipeline will substantially impair the health, safety and welfare of South Dakota communities. The pipeline will destroy natural resources that are needed to sustain South Dakota as a leader in agriculture and tourism. Also, South Dakota does not have state inspectors or funds to protect citizens from pipeline accidents.

The Dakota Access Pipeline would not serve the good of the public. It is all risk and no reward for South Dakota and its residents. The pipeline would be a negative legacy for all South Dakotans.

The potential impact of an oil spill or leak to water and land quality for both private and public lands would be devastating and costly to South Dakota's communities.

The remedy that I seek is to outright deny a permit to construct the Dakota Access crude oil pipeline in South Dakota. I do not want to see family farms disturbed. Where will this product go and be used? Is the pipeline inspected? Hope there is no leak by the river and near the lakes that it is passed very close to, like Wall Lake.

Please consider how it will effect our land--

Sharon Bruns

[REDACTED]
Centerville, SD 57014
[REDACTED]

From: PUC

Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 3:47 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: HP14-002

Thank you for your message regarding the Dakota Access Pipeline. It will be posted in the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission's formal pipeline siting docket, HP14-002, under Comments and Responses. Here is a link to the docket: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-002.aspx> Since this is an open docket before the commission, correspondence is posted in the open, public docket so that the other commissioners and all parties to the case have access to it.

You may be interested in this Pipeline Siting Info Guide:

<http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and Dakota Access Pipeline FAQ:

<http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-002faq.aspx>

Chairman Chris Nelson

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

www.puc.sd.gov

004608

From: Larry Zikmund [<mailto:lzikmund@sio.midco.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 3:53 PM

To: Nelson, Chris

Cc: lzikmund@sio.midco.net

Subject: Dakota Access Pipeline permit

Chairman Commissioner Chris Nelson

South Dakota PUC

Dear Commissioner Nelson:

As a concerned State Representative, a citizen, taxpayer, and a supporter of workforce development, I am always looking for ways to expand the tax base in ways that will not put new burdens on our citizens. Rarely do we as a state have the opportunity to increase revenue by simply approving a permit. However, that is what we can do by issuing the Dakota Access Pipeline permit.

If permitted by the PUC, Dakota Access Pipeline will bring in new tax revenue for the state, counties and school districts along the pipeline route. In addition, the construction of the pipeline will give thousands of various contractors, subcontractors and suppliers employment for several months. As a former vocational education instructor and working in different occupational fields, it is important to workforce development and employment in the state employing people in the areas of welders, utility workers, excavators, heavy equipment operators and a bevy of local services. Building the pipeline would have well paid jobs during the construction. The State of South Dakota would also have a boon of tax revenue from the "Contractors Excise Tax" and "Use and Sales Taxes" for all materials purchased in South Dakota to complete the project.

Following construction, schools would be able to count on increased tax revenue for generations. Utility companies would have a reliable, constant energy customer whose

electric consumption would be easy to gauge. Counties would have a business partner that provides taxes for roads and bridges, law enforcement along with other services.

Thank you for your service as PUC Chairman, and for taking account all the benefits which would come from approving the permit for the Dakota Access Pipeline.

Sincerely,

Larry P. Zikmund
State Representative
District 14, Sioux Falls SD
605-373-0975

From: Michael Zerr [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 8:22:22 PM
To: PUC
Subject: Re: HP14-002

Hi Gary, just thought I would throw some words toward the Dakota Access discussion. I attended one of the PUC hearings in Sioux Falls, and talked to folks from both sides of the discussion. I also am on a committee that works with [Dewey Gevik Outdoor Learning Area](#) on the west side of Wall Lake. As a geographer and naturalist, I took a good look at topographic and other maps showing the areas where the DAP would go.

At the hearing, when the DAP folks explained the PSI, leak response or shut off time, and related issues, I was aghast as to the possible damage to the Wall Lake area watershed.

The creek that feeds Dewey and Wall Lake starts in [Fensterman's Slough](#), which is really a nice sized lake, and winds up in Skunk Creek near Family Fishing Park in Sioux Falls. Based on the information they gave, before a shut off, enough chemical laden oil would get into the watershed to destroy Dewey and Wall Lake, and, if it happened in the Spring, or other high water time, it would eventually reach Skunk Creek. I am sure other areas along the pipeline route are in a similar situation.

Other major fears include:

- No bond for clean up, property damage, etc. nor for the time when it is abandoned.
- The fact that thousands of pipe sections are piled up near Canton and Aberdeen, with rail spurs just built for their access. All making it look like approval is a done deal, and any hearings are a sham.
- The lack of availability of close up maps of the pipeline route on line so folks could see the big picture. (The SF city GIS folks offered to put those maps on their site for public access, but that did not occur.)
- The use of Eminent Domain by a private for profit that has nothing to do with the public in SD. This is vital to both the Keystone XL, where a foreign entity is imposing it, and the DAP. The State of SD has the right through [Police Power](#), to prevent these impositions on the rights of property owners, or regulate them more.

At the least, the state should require bonding, limit Eminent Domain, and require movement away from sensitive areas such as lakes, rivers, and towns. Payments to landowners should not be one time only, but annually.

I know the PUC does not have authority to do many of the suggestions, but they can recommend them to the legislature or governor as a condition before blanket approval of DAP or Keystone.

Thanks for listening

Mick Zerr



Sioux Falls SD 57106